

PATENT
P56382**REMARKS**

The final Office action mailed on 3 November 2004 (Paper No. 20041021) has been carefully considered. For the reasons stated below, clarification is requested.

It should first be noted that dependent claim 25 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in the previous Amendment After Final. Thus, claims 1, 4 thru 12, 15 thru 24 and 26 thru 35 should be pending in this application. However, paragraph 4 of the Office action Summary states that claims 1, 4 thru 12 and 15 thru 35 are pending. Moreover, paragraph 7 of the Office action states that claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Kuo *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,226,040 in view of Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,473,130. This raises a question as to whether the Amendment After Final has been entered and/or whether the statement of pendency and rejection of claim 25 is in error. Clarification is requested.

Paragraph 4 of the Office action states that independent claim 22, among others, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 for alleged anticipation by Kuo *et al.* '040. However, in the Amendment After Final, independent claim 22 was amended to include the recitation of dependent claim 25, which was canceled. Moreover, in paragraph 5 of the previous final Office action, and in paragraph 7 of the present Office action, claims 25 and 26 were/are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Kuo *et al.* '040 in view of Kim '130. As a result, independent claim 22 (which now includes the recitation of canceled claim 25) and its dependent claims should now be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Kuo *et al.* '040 in combination with Kim '130 at the minimum, presuming that the Amendment After Final was entered. Clarification is requested.

-2-

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PATENT
P56382

Finally, paragraph 4 of the Office action states that claim 30, among others, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 based on Kuo *et al.* '040, but paragraph 6 of the Office action states that claim 30, among others, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Kuo *et al.* '040 in view of Suen *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,552,750. No detailed reasons or grounds for the second rejection of claim 30 (based on Kuo *et al.* '040 and Suen *et al.* '750) are given in paragraph 6 of the Office action. This duplicate rejection of claim 30 also appeared in the final Office action (Paper No. 8), and clarification was requested on page 12 of the Amendment After Final filed on 20 February 2004, but no clarification was provided and the duplicate rejection has appeared again in the present Office action. Clarification as to the status of claim 30 is again requested.

Applicants are unable to respond with certainty to the Office action until the above-requested clarification is provided. Should there be any questions, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the below listed local telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56382
Date: 12/30/04
I.D.: REB/JGS

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.